

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/579,291	Applicant(s) GERK, CHRISTIAN	
	Examiner H. T. Le	Art Unit 1794	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) H. T. Le. (3) Christian Gerk, Applicant.
 (2) Ashley Pezzner, Attorney. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 03 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Massey et al (US 6,248,149).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed to amend the product claims to include the process limitation and amend the process claims to be dependent on the independent product claim. The examiner agreed that the amendment would overcome the rejection based on the Massey patent. ...

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/H. (Holly) T. Le/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794